

LEADERSHIP POWER PERCEPTION OF AMATEUR AND PROFESSIONAL SOCCER COACHES ACCORDING TO THEIR MARITAL STATUS

■ Accepted
for publication
16.04.2010

AUTHOR: Konter E.

Dokuz Eylül University, Department of Education, Buca, İzmir, Türkiye

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study was to analyse the leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches according to their marital status. Data were collected from 165 male soccer coaches (n=71 technical director-manager and A license, n=46 B license, n=48 amateur license). An adapted Turkish version of Power in Soccer Questionnaire-Self (PSQ-S for coaches) and an information form were used for the data collection [21]. Cronbach reliability alphas of PSQ-S range between 0.65 and 0.84. Coaches' data were analysed by Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests. Kruskal-Wallis analysis of PSQ-S revealed significant differences between leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches according to their marital status related to Referent Power (RP) [$\chi^2(3) = 9.61, p < 0.022$] and Expert Power (EP) [$\chi^2(3) = 16.52, p < 0.001$], and no significant differences related to Coercive Power (CP) or Legitimate Power (LP) ($p > 0.05$). The results indicated that married coaches have higher perception of RP than single coaches, irrespective of being an amateur or a professional. Comparison of professional and amateur coaches suggests that while single professional coaches have higher perception of EP than married professional coaches, the results are the reverse for amateur coaches; in other words, amateur married coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches. There is a lack of research to draw more certain conclusions. Future researchers should also take into consideration personality, psychological skills, sport experience, age, taking responsibility, attributions, expectations, emotions, perception of achievement, etc.

KEY WORDS: leadership, power perception, soccer, soccer coach, marital status

INTRODUCTION

Leaders' influence and followers' compliance have frequently been studied in social and organizational psychology within a theoretical framework known as the bases of social power [9,10]. Sport leadership has also been a very intriguing area for practitioners and researchers [5,10]. French and Raven [9] identified five sources of interpersonal power (reward, coercive, referent, legitimate and expert powers) in leadership. Wann et al. [38] adapted these interpersonal powers to sport settings, showing the psychometrically sound validity and reliability results of the five-factor model in North America. Konter [21] recently adapted these scales in Turkish language using soccer players and coaches. Despite these recent developments, there is a striking paucity of research related to sport leadership power in general [38] and soccer leadership power in particular.

People in general, and coaches, sport officials, players, and even spectators in particular, possess power to the extent that they have the ability to influence or change the attitudes or behaviours of others [9] in a socio-cultural environment. French and Raven [9] conducted the most influential work on power and defined five

interpersonal or social powers: (1) Reward Power involves the ability to reward others, such as verbal praise, positive body language, and more playing time. (2) Coercive Power concerns the ability to control access to one or more punishments, for example verbal reprimands, negative gestures, giving less playing time, making players run laps or do sit ups or push ups. (3) Legitimate Power involves the ability to use one's position and authority within the organization, group or team, for example, being an authority figure, possessing official status, ownership of the organization, being the head coach, etc. (4) Expert Power is derived from the perception that one is knowledgeable, skilful, or talented in a specific domain, for example, being a former star in that sport, having specific education and experience, having been awarded many titles or medals. (5) Referent Power involves the ability to be liked and respected by the group members, for example, athletes like, respect and admire their coaches, and follow their decisions [9,38].

In addition to French and Raven's [9] interpersonal power construct, two other typologies have also been proposed. Kelman [19] put forward a three-power taxonomy including compliance, identification

Reprint request to:

Konter Erkut

Dokuz Eylül University
Department of Education
Buca/İzmir/TÜRKİYE

Phone: 90(232)4204882/87 Work
GSM: +90(533)4660120

E-mail: erkut.konter@deu.edu.tr

and internalization, while a number of authors have suggested a two-power typology incorporating personal and positional powers [38,41]. Compliance reflects reward and coercive powers, identification corresponds to referent power, and internalization matches legitimate and expert power. Position power can be equated with reward, coercive, and legitimate powers, while personal power is congruent with referent and expert powers [37,38,41].

Perception of power can affect satisfaction [17,29], ability [35], positive assessment [23], team cohesion [26], success and performance [12,14]. Cushion and Jones [8] found that instruction, praising and keeping silence respectively are the dominant behaviours in coaching of British football. Lyle [25] also indicated that coaching, in general and specifically, involves developing the sporting ability of athletes. Researchers have reported that the relationship between coaches and athletes is a dynamic process, changing over time and conditions, affecting the thoughts, emotions and behaviours of both sides [18]. Coaches prefer a more authoritarian style (LP and CP) than athletes [6]. Coaches who care about the thoughts and emotions of their athletes develop a better relationship with them [33].

Robinson and Carron [30] showed that less successful players perceived their coaches as being more autocratic, and this result was consistent with Garland and Barry's [12] work in which performance was assessed by the playing time. Vernacchia et al. [36] proposed that three keys to the success of most great coaches are anticipation, preparation and dedication to the pursuit of excellence. Coaches have many commitments: to their sport, athletes, ideas and goals, which take time, energy and emotion [36]. Bloom [2] argued that athletes working with coaches who have hard working qualities and better communication skills are more satisfied, more successful, have better developed skills, and more chance of self-realization and actualization. It has also been put forward that athletes and coaches need to make commitments related to long- and short-term planning for training sessions including detailed physical, technical, tactical and psychological preparations [1]. Therefore, athletes and coaches are supposed to correctly manage their training sessions and life styles, as well as effectively set goals and determine priorities in order to have higher possibility of achievements and performance. Gould et al. [15] interestingly revealed that seminars and text books have a minimal effect in informational resources of coaches. The studies indicated that factors leading to success for coaches are learning from their own experience, applying their own style, adapting to the changing conditions and monitoring other successful coaches.

Weiss and Friedrichs [39] found that perceived social support was the strongest predictor of a team's win-loss record. The greater the perception of social support, the lower the record of performance. Conversely, Horne and Carron [17] reported that as perception of positive feedback increased, so did athletes' perception of their own level of performance. In addition, Gordon [14] found that members of successful teams perceived greater levels of training

and instruction, autocratic behaviour, social support, and positive feedback. Moreover, Serpa et al. [34] indicated that members of the first-place team at the 1988 world championships perceived greater levels of autocratic behaviour and less positive feedback, social support, and democratic behaviour than did players from the last-placed team.

Konter [21] found significant differences between professional and amateur licensed soccer coaches related to LP and EP, and no significant differences in terms of CP and RP. Further analyses showed that: (a) LP perception score of amateur licensed coaches are higher than B licensed coaches, (b) EP perception scores of A licensed coaches are higher than B and amateur licensed coaches. Overall, the results indicated that, while professional soccer coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur soccer coaches, amateur soccer coaches have higher LP than professional soccer coaches.

Lee [24] conducted a study comparing active and inactive technical college students in extracurricular activities and found that increased commuting distance, marital status, and high school activities, size, and leadership experiences did affect participation. Konter [22] also revealed that single professional players have better commitment skill than married ones in soccer. Salmela [32] argued that many coaches chose not to get married because many of them travelled for 200 days of the year. This was a sacrifice they chose to make, and one that they believed helped them progress up the coaching ranks. According to Salmela's [32] experiences, most of the coaches stated that marrying a former athlete or fellow coach was the ideal solution, or marrying a spouse who clearly understood the sacrifices that they would have to make. Sabock [31] indicated that coaching is an extremely demanding occupation, which places demands in terms of time, energy, family life, social life, and physical well-being, and eventually it takes its toll. Unfortunately, coaches often pay the price themselves, and the price can be destruction of marriages [36]. In addition, Cabrini [4] identified the main events directly connected to severe stress, which include family life and work. Moreover, Vernacchia, et al. [36] argued that the stresses and strains of combining a successful career and a successful marriage and family life are certainly not new issues (particularly in American society), nor are they unique to the coaching profession. The authors also suggested that while some of the difficulties can likely be traced to poor choices of marital partners, many are a direct result of the couple's inability to achieve and maintain a workable balance between their personal and professional lives.

Soccer coaches can have difficulty in balancing their marriage and coaching commitments. This might cause coaches to adapt their relationship to their jobs rather than their jobs to their relationships. As a result, coaches cannot give enough time and energy to their spouses and their other intimate relationships. Otherwise, it is not possible to survive in professional sport and achieve high performance. For example, Nideffer et al. [27] argued that it is necessary for high performers to prefer to give priority to

their sport involvement over their family and friendships and also to dedicate themselves to their intensive training sessions.

Difficulties of soccer life and demands of family life can create complex problems for coaches. Athletes and coaches have relationships within and outside their sport life. The role of coaches and athletes in their family and marriage life can affect their emotions, cognition, behaviours and sport performance [7]. Quality of coaches' performance achievement can also affect their relationships, for example problems of independence, identity, intimacy, power struggle, confidence, control and communication, etc. Thus, increasing social support and decreasing stress related to marriage can help coaches to achieve better adaptation to their jobs, to have more satisfying relationships, and to boost their performance [7].

News in the media can positively or negatively affect single and married coaches' emotions and behaviours, for example news related to violence in the family, a supportive spouse, a cheating spouse, flirting, sexual relationships, jealousy, etc. A lot of news appearing in the media can create sensitivity and anger related to the life style of single and married coaches and affects their psychology [3,7,16]. While coaches and players are sometimes suggested to get married to have a better and more organized life, which are thought to help improve performance, it is also argued that coaches and players lose their previous high achievements after getting married.

Being single or married can place different demands on coaches and affect their perception of leadership power. There is definitely a lack of research related to perception of leadership power and marital status of coaches in soccer. The forms of the PSQ would also be of value to sport psychology leadership research in soccer, because they could provide information about coaches' perception of coercive, referent, legitimate and expert powers and shed light on problems of behaviour, satisfaction and performance. Therefore, the objective of this research was to analyse the leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches according to their marital status.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants. Data were collected from 165 male soccer coaches (n=71 technical director and A license, n=46 B license, n=48 amateur license). The coaches had a mean age of 40.24 years (SD=8.40) and had been coaching for an average of 8.56 years (SD=6.75).

Instrument

Wann et al. [38] pioneered the use of French and Raven's five interpersonal powers construct in sports and developed the Power in Sport Questionnaires (PSQ-O for players and PSQ-S for coaches). Konter [21] adapted the PSQ forms related to soccer for Turkey and found relatively similar results with the elimination of 4 items from PSQ-S as a result of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses. The Turkish version of PSQ-S used in this study has a total of

11 items with four factors: coercive, referent, legitimate and expert powers. The analysis of PSQ-S for Turkey revealed that the subscales were internally consistent, ranging from 0.65 to 0.84 [21]. PSQ-S has a Likert-scale format and responses to each item range from 1 (this is very untrue) to 9 (this is very true). Item examples of PSQ-S are as follows [38]: "Others do what I ask and abide by my decisions because I am in charge in this sport" (legitimate power, item 4); "Others do what I ask and abide by my decisions because they like me" (referent power, item 3); "Others do what I ask and abide by my decisions because I have the ability to punish them" (coercive power, item 2); "Others do what I ask and abide by my decisions because I have a great deal of knowledge about this sport" (expert power, item 5).

Procedures and Data Collection

The adapted Turkish version of PSQ-S and a questionnaire related to demographic variables including the level of coaching and marital status of coaches were applied for the data collection. Head coaches for soccer clubs were contacted and the nature of the research project was explained. The coaches were informed that the research involved coaches' and athletes' perceptions of influences related to leadership power in soccer. After the coaches consented to participate in the research, a meeting time and place for testing sessions were determined.

At the testing session, coaches briefly were given information about the research project and they were encouraged to answer the questionnaire honestly. They were also asked not to put their names on the forms and were informed that their answers would only be used for research purposes and kept confidential. The PSQ-S form with brief instructions was then administered to coaches. The PSQ-S form also had some demographic questions to collect information about participants' ages, gender, sport, years of experience, marital status and educational level. Completion of the PSQ-S form required approximately 10-15 minutes.

Analysis of Data

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests for 2 X 2 comparisons were applied, after Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test analysis had been carried out to check the coaches' data distribution. Comparisons were made between four dependent (CP, RP, LP and EP), and four independent variables (professional married coaches, professional single coaches, amateur married coaches and amateur single coaches).

As the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test showed that the data of some variables in the analysis are not normally distributed (specifically, amateur married, amateur single, professional married, but not professional single coaches), and one small number of one independent variable (number of professional single coaches = 9) out of four exists (see Table 1), Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests were used for the data analysis.

SPSS 11.1 software was used for data analysis. Results of the analysed data are presented below.

RESULTS

Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney test results of the leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches according to their marital status are presented in Table 2.

Analysis of PSQ-S revealed significant differences between leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches according to their marital status related to RP [$\chi^2(3) = 9.61$, $p < 0.022$] and EP [$\chi^2(3) = 16.52$, $p < 0.001$], and no significant differences as regards CP and LP ($p > 0.05$).

Comparative analysis using the Mann-Whitney test yielded the following results as regards RP of amateur and professional soccer coaches and their marital status: mean rank analysis showed that professional married coaches (mean rank = 80.05) have higher perception of RP than professional single coaches (mean rank = 41.04). In addition, amateur married coaches (mean rank = 92.29) have higher perception of RP than professional single coaches (mean rank = 41.94). Moreover, amateur single coaches (mean rank = 79.19) have higher perception of RP than professional single coaches (mean rank = 41.94). It seems that married coaches have higher perception of RP than single coaches, no matter whether they are amateur or professional.

Comparative analysis using the Mann-Whitney test also yielded the following results related to EP of amateur and professional soccer coaches and their marital status: mean rank analysis showed that

professional married coaches (mean rank = 94.30) have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches (mean rank = 78.10). In addition, professional single coaches (mean rank = 106.67) have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches (mean rank = 78.10). Moreover, amateur married coaches (mean rank = 81.04) have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches (mean rank = 78.10). It seems that whether married or single, professional coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur coaches. Comparisons within groups of professional and amateur coaches suggest that single professional coaches have higher perception of EP than married professional coaches (mean rank of single professional coaches = 106.67 and mean rank of married professional coaches = 94.30), while the results are the reverse for amateur coaches; in other words, amateur married coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches (mean rank of amateur married coaches = 81.04 and mean rank of amateur single coaches = 78.10).

Table 2 shows that there are significant differences between perception of coaches' RP and EP, and their marital status. However, effect sizes of the variables are not large. Effect sizes are for RP eta-squared = 0.074, R-squared = 0.074, adjusted R-squared = 0.056 ($p < 0.022$); and for EP, eta-squared = 0.12, R-squared = 0.12, adjusted R-squared = 0.10 ($p < 0.001$). Effect sizes are interpreted as showing that perception of coaches' RP and EP related to their marital status explain 7.4% of RP and 12% of EP. In other words,

TABLE I. NORMALITY TEST OF SOCCER COACHES' DATA RELATED TO THEIR MARITAL STATUS

PSQ-S COACHES' LEADERSHIP POWER	N	Mean	SD	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	P	Distribution of the Data	
CP-COERCIVE POWER							
1) Professional- Married	61	12.76	5.46	0.095	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
2) Professional-Single	9	12.00	5.14	0.170	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
3) Amateur-Married	63	11.54	5.62	0.146	< 0.01	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
4) Amateur-Single	31	12.84	4.63	0.166	0.03	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
TOTAL	164	12.06	5.33				
RP-REFERENT POWER							
1) Prof- Married	61	20.16	4.11	0.110	0.06	$p > 0.05$	Not normal
2) Prof- Single	9	15.22	6.26	0.171	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
3) Ama-Married	63	20.95	4.71	0.175	< 0.01	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
4) Ama-Single	31	20.10	4.27	0.100	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
TOTAL	164	20.19	4.63				
LP-LEGITIMATE POWER							
1) Professional-Married	61	12.52	4.36	0.173	< 0.01	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
2) Professional-Single	9	13.44	2.01	0.143	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
3) Amateur-Married	63	12.38	3.99	0.165	< 0.01	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
4) Amateur-Single	31	11.97	3.96	0.151	0.07	$p > 0.05$	Not normal
TOTAL	164	12.38	4.05				
EP-EXPERT POWER							
1) Professional-Married	61	23.54	3.29	0.172	< 0.01	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
2) Professional-Single	9	23.56	3.32	0.224	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
3) Amateur-Married	63	21.20	4.50	0.118	0.03	$p < 0.05$	Not normal
4) Amateur-Single	31	18.59	5.26	0.123	0.20	$p > 0.05$	Normal
TOTAL	164	21.34	4.41				



TABLE 2. KRUSKAL-WALLIS AND MANN-WHITNEY TEST RESULTS OF THE LEADERSHIP POWER PERCEPTION OF AMATEUR AND PROFESSIONAL SOCCER COACHES ACCORDING TO THEIR MARITAL STATUS

PSQ-S COACHES	N	Mean	SD	SE	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	P	Significance
CP						3	1.96	0.58	NO
1) Prof. Married	61	12.76	5.46	0.70	89.07				
2) Prof. Single	9	12.00	5.14	0.60	83.33				
3) Ama. Married	63	11.54	5.62	1.40	78.19				
4) Ama. Single	31	12.84	4.63	0.72	78.10				
TOTAL	164	12.06	5.33	0.42					
RP						3	9.61	0.02	YES
1) Prof. Married	61	20.16	4.11	0.53	80.05				1 and 2 ($p < .022$)
2) Prof. Single	9	15.22	6.26	2.09	41.94				2 and 3 ($p < .004$)
3) Ama. Married	63	20.95	4.71	0.59	92.29				2 and 4 ($p < .04$)
4) Ama. Single	31	20.10	4.27	0.77	79.19				
TOTAL	164	20.19	4.63	0.36					
LP						3	1.28	0.74	NO
1) Prof. Married	61	12.52	4.36	0.56	85.54				
2) Prof. Single	9	13.44	2.01	0.67	88.94				
3) Ama. Married	63	12.38	3.99	0.50	82.50				
4) Ama. Single	31	11.97	3.96	0.71	74.65				
TOTAL	164	12.38	4.05	0.32					
EP						3	16.52	<0.01	YES
1) Prof. Married	61	23.54	3.29	0.42	94.30				1 and 4 ($p < .000$)
2) Prof. Single	9	23.56	3.32	1.11	106.67				2 and 4 ($p < .01$)
3) Ama. Married	63	21.20	4.50	0.57	81.04				3 and 4 ($p < .02$)
4) Ama. Single	31	18.59	5.26	0.95	78.10				
TOTAL	164	21.34	4.41	0.34					

92.6% of RP and 88% of EP are explained by the different variables in the model.

DISCUSSION

Analysis of PSQ-S revealed significant differences between leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches according to their marital status related to RP and EP, and no significant differences were found as regards with CP and LP.

Further analyses showed that professional married coaches have higher perception of RP than professional single coaches. In addition, amateur married coaches have higher perception of RP than professional single coaches. Moreover, amateur single coaches have higher perception of RP than professional single coaches. It seems that no matter whether they are amateur or professional, married coaches have higher perception of RP than single coaches. This result supports the contentions of Nideffer et al. [27], who argued that it is necessary for high performers to want to give priority to their involvement in sport over their family, and Coppel's [7] argument that increasing social support and decreasing stress related to marriage can help coaches to have better adaptation to their jobs [7]. Results obtained from the present study in terms of RP do not support the view that single professional coaches have better commitment skills than married ones in soccer. When coaches are particularly taken

into consideration [22], there are no significant differences between professional and amateur soccer coaches' RP perception [20], and the greater the perception of social support, the lower the record of performance [39]. The present study also indicated that being married partly seems to help RP.

Comparative analysis using the Mann-Whitney test also showed that professional married coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches. In addition, professional single coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches. Moreover, amateur married coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches. It seems that irrespective of being married or single, professional coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur coaches. Comparison of professional and amateur coaches suggests that single professional coaches have higher perception of EP than married professional coaches, while the results are the reverse for amateur coaches; in other words, amateur married coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur single coaches. This result supports the view that: (a) professional soccer coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur soccer coaches [20]; (b) coaching, in general and specifically, involves developing the sporting ability of athletes [25]; (c) perception affects success and performance [12,13]; (d) most great coaches have qualities related to anticipation, preparation and dedication to the pursuit of excellence [36];

(e) athletes working with coaches who have hard working qualities and better communication skills are more satisfied, more successful, have better developed skills, and more chance of self-realization and actualization [2]; and (f) coaches need to make commitments related to long- and short-term planning for training sessions including detailed physical, technical, tactical and psychological preparations [1]. The findings of the present study related to EP partly support the findings of Gould et al. [15] that seminars and text books have a minimal effect in informational resources of coaches, and that successful coaches learn from their own experience, apply their own style, adapt to the changing conditions and monitor other successful coaches.

In addition, the present study supports the view that there are no significant differences between amateur and professional soccer coaches related to perception of CP, and do not support the finding that amateur soccer coaches have higher perception of LP than professional soccer coaches [20].

Table 2 shows that there are significant differences between perception of coaches' RP and EP, and their marital status. However, effect sizes of the variables are not large as indicated above.

CONCLUSIONS

It seems that there are complex relationships between all variables involved in the research related to coaches' data. There is almost no research related to leadership power perception of coaches including their marital status. Therefore, it is difficult to make comments in detail on supporting and not supporting studies at present. It also

appears that there is a need for a theoretical link to facilitate the research questions and findings in the future related to leadership power and marital status in sport.

Overall, the results showed that: a) whether amateur or professional, married coaches have higher perception of RP than single coaches, and b) whether married or single, professional coaches have higher perception of EP than amateur coaches. While RP seems more related to coaches' marriage in soccer, EP appears to be more connected with the level of coaching in soccer.

Leadership power perception of coaches might also be related to other variables apart from marital status, for example: level of coaches' formal education and personality, marrying a former athlete or fellow coach [32], social life and physical well-being, time and energy [31], stress, poor choices of marital partners, imbalance between personal and professional lives [16,36], gender, age groups and performance achievements. Obviously, more research is needed to form more certain conclusions related to leadership power perception of coaches related to their marital status. Therefore, future research in perception of coaches' leadership power and their marital status should also take into consideration other individual, situational factors and concentrate on the theoretical links, for example: gender, sport experience, age, duration of marriage, number of children, taking responsibility, self-confidence, attributions, expectations, emotions, perception of achievement, available assistants, taking marriage counselling, time constraints, culture, etc.

REFERENCES

- Bloom G.A. Coaching demands and responsibilities of expert coaches. J.M.Silva III and E.S.Diana (eds.) Psychological Foundations of Sport. Allyn and Bacon, Boston 2001;pp.438-465.
- Bloom G.A. Characteristics, strategies, and knowledge of expert team sport coaches. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 1997.
- Botterill C. Sport psychology and professional hockey. *Sport Psychologist* 1990;4:358-368.
- Cabrini M. The Psychology of Soccer. Reedswain Inc., Spring City 1999.
- Chelladurai P. Leadership in sports: A review. *Int. J. Sport Psychol.* 1990;21:328-354.
- Chelladurai P., Haggerty T.R., Baxter P.R. Decision style-choices of university basketball coaches and players. *J. Sport Exerc. Psychol.* 1989;11:201-215.
- Coppel D.B. Relationship issues in sport: A marital therapy model. In: S.Murphy (ed.) *Sport Psychology Interventions.* Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL. 1995;pp.193-204.
- Cushion C.J., Jones R.L. A systematic observation of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *J. Sport Behav.* 2001;24:354-376.
- French J., Raven B.H. The bases of social power. In: D.Cartwright (ed.) *Studies in Social Power.* Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor 1959;pp.150-167.
- Frost D.E., Stahelski A.J. The systematic measurement of French and Raven's bases of social power in workgroups. *J. Appl. Social Psychol.* 1988;18:375-389.
- Garland D.J., Barry J.R. Personality and leader behaviors in collegiate football: A multidimensional approach to performance. *J. Res. Personality* 1990;24:355-370.
- Garland D.J., Barry J.R. The effects of personality and perceived leader behavior on performance in collegiate football. *Psychol. Record* 1988;38:237-247.
- Gordon S. Decision styles and coaching effectiveness in university soccer. *Can. J. Sport Sci.* 1988;13:36-55.
- Gordon S. Behavioral correlates of coaching effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Alberta, Canada 1986.
- Gould G.J., Krane V., Hodge K. Educational needs of elite U.S. national team, Pan American and Olympic coaches. *J. Teaching Phys. Educ.* 1990;9:332-344.
- Heyman S. Counseling and psychotherapy with athletes: Special considerations. J.May and M.Askan (eds.) *Sport Psychology: The Psychological Health of the Athlete.* PMA, New York 1987;pp.135-156.
- Home T., Carron A.V. Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. *J. Sport Behav.* 1985;7:137-149.
- Jowett S., Poczwadowski A. Understanding the coach-athlete relationship. S.Jowett and D.Lavallee (eds.) *Social Psychology in Sport.* Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL. 2007.
- Kelman H.C. Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three process of attitude change. *J. Conflict Revolution* 1958;2:51-60.
- Kontar E. Leadership power perception of amateur and professional soccer coaches According to their success. *Personality, Motivation, Sport.* Vol. 13. National Sports Academy, Sofia, Bulgaria, 2008.
- Kontar E. Towards Adaptation of Self and Other Versions of the Revised Power in Soccer Questionnaire for Turkey. *European Sport Management Quarterly,* 2009;9:311-332.
- Kontar E. Profesyonel futbolcuların Medeni Durumlarına Göre Psikolojik

- Becerilerinin Araştırılması (Investigation of psychological skills of professional soccer players according to marital status). *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi* (Gazi J. Phys. Educ. Sport Sci.) 2005;40:25-32.
23. Laughlin N., Laughlin S. The relationship between the similarity in perceptions of teacher/coach leader behavior and evolution of their effectiveness. *Int. J. Sport Psychol.* 1994;22:396-410.
24. Lee L.R. A comparative study of students active and inactive in extracurricular activities while enrolled in second year associate degrees programs on the Kenosha and Racine Campuses of Gateway Technical Institute. Ph.D. Dissertation. Kenosha, Wisconsin 1979.
25. Lyle J. *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behavior*. Routledge, London 2002;pp.38-40.
26. Maby R.K. The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and group cohesion in professional football. Nova Southeastern University. Dissertation Abstracts. International Section B: The Sciences and Engineering 1997;57(9-B), 5902.
27. Nideffer N., Segal M., Lowry M., Bond J. Identifying and developing world-class performers. In: G.Tenenbaum (ed.) *The Practice of Sport Psychology*. Fitness Information Technology Inc., West Virginia 2001.
28. Reimer H.A. Multidimensional model of coach leadership. In: S.Jowett and D. Lavallee (eds.) *Social Psychology in Sport*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL. 2007;pp.57-73.
29. Riemer H.A., Chelladurai P. Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. *J. Sport Exerc. Psychol.* 1995;17:276-293.
30. Robinson T.T., Carron A.V. Personal and situational factors associated with dropping out versus maintaining participation in competitive sport. *J. Sport Psychol.* 1983;4:364-378.
31. Sabock R.J. *Coaching: A realistic perspective*. Collegiate Press, San Diego 1991.
32. Salmela J.H. *Great job coach: Getting the edge from proven winners*. Potentium, Ottawa 1996.
33. Salminen S., Lukkonen J. The convergent and discriminant validity of the coach's version of the Leadership Scale for Sport. *Int. J. Sport Psychol.* 1994;25:119-127.
34. Serpa S., Pataco V., Santos F. Leadership pattern in handball international competition. *Int. J. Sport Psychol.* 1991;22, 78-89.
35. Summers R. J. Russel J. Association between athletes' perception of their abilities on the influence of coach technical-instruction. *J. Sport Behav.* 1991;14:30-40.
36. Vernacchia R., McGuire R., Cook D. *Coaching Excellence. WCB Brown and Benchmark, Dubuque* 1992.
37. Wagner J.A., Hollenbeck J.R. *Organizational behavior: Securing competitive advantage*. 3rd Ed. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ., 1998.
38. Wann D.L., Metcalf L.A., Brewer K.R., Whiteside H.D. Development of the power in sport questionnaires. *J. Sport Behav.* 2000;23:423-443.
39. Weiss R.M., Friedrichs W.D. The influence of leader behaviors, coach attributes, and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams. *J. Sport Psychol.* 1986;8:332-346.
40. Yukl G. *Leadership in Organizations*. 5th Ed. Prentice Hall, New Jersey 2002.
41. Yukl G., Falbe C.M. Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 1991;76:416-423.